

# FOREST MANAGEMENT AND STUMP-TO-FOREST GATE CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY SURVEILLANCE EVALUATION REPORT

## *Collins Pine Company*

*Collins Almanor Forest*

Chester, California, USA

### SCS-FM/COC-00006N

Client Address	PO Box 796, Chester, CA 96020, USA
Client Contact	Niel Fischer, Forest Manager
Client Website	<a href="http://www.collinswood.com">www.collinswood.com</a>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
1 August 2018	31 July 2023

DATE OF FIELD EVALUATION
2-3 June 2021
DATE OF REPORT FINALIZATION
14 January 2022

SCS Contact:

**Brendan Grady** | Director  
Forest Management Certification  
+1.510.452.8000

[bgrady@scsglobalservices.com](mailto:bgrady@scsglobalservices.com)

**SCS**global  
SERVICES  
Setting the standard for sustainability™

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA  
+1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax  
[www.SCSglobalServices.com](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)

## Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance evaluations				
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual evaluation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other ( <i>expansion of scope, Major CAR audit, special audit, etc.</i> ):
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:				
Collins Almanor Forest (CAF)				

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual evaluations to ascertain ongoing conformance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the FSC Certificate Database <http://info.fsc.org/>. Pursuant to FSC and SCS guidelines, annual / surveillance evaluations are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope evaluation would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC evaluation protocols. Rather, annual evaluations are comprised of three main components:

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 4.0 for those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual evaluation);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to this evaluation; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the evaluation.

### Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 90 days after completion of the on-site evaluation. Section B contains more detailed results and information for required FSC record-keeping or the use by the FME.

## Table of Contents

---

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY .....	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION .....	4
1.1 Evaluation Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation .....	4
1.3 Applicable Standards .....	4
1.4 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units.....	5
2. CERTIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS .....	5
2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes.....	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems .....	10
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES .....	11
4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION .....	11
4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations.....	11
4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period.....	11
4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	12
4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	16
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	17
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted .....	17
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses .....	18
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	18
7. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	19
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	24
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected for Evaluation .....	24
Appendix 2 – Staff and Stakeholders Consulted.....	24
Appendix 3 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed .....	25
Appendix 4 – Required Tracking .....	25
Appendix 5 – Forest Management Standard Conformance Table .....	26
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs Conformance Table .....	49
Appendix 7 – Trademark Standard Conformance Table.....	54
Appendix 8 – Group Management Program.....	58

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1. General Information

#### 1.1 Evaluation Team

<b>Auditor name:</b>	Stefan A. Bergmann	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Audit Team Leader
<b>Qualifications:</b>	Mr. Bergmann has been in the forestry and wood products field for nearly 20 years, working across the US on forest policy, landowner extension, and forest certification. He also has senior staff executive experience with two forestry non-profits in the Midwest. Prior to joining SCS in 2017, he worked for Rainforest Alliance, overseeing the Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) Forest Management auditing program in the US. He has successfully completed FSC Forest Management Lead Auditor training, ISO 9001 Lead Auditor training, and is qualified to be an SFI team auditor. He has served as lead and team auditors on numerous FSC FM audits around the country. He holds an MBA from University of California Davis, as well as an MS in Forest Resources and BS in Wildlife Science from Oregon State University		
<b>Observer name:</b>	Alejandro Anasal	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Observer
<b>Qualifications:</b>	Alejandro has worked in the SCS Forest Management Department since 2019. In his role as Program Coordinator he organizes and monitors the annual audit programs for more than 200 Forest Management certifications worldwide. Prior to working with SCS, he worked as a Utility Forester for PG&E and as a Forest Resource Assistant for Berkeley Forests at Blodgett Forest Research Station. Alejandro is an experienced forest researcher who has contributed to studies of prescribed fire in the Sierra Nevada Mountains of California, riparian forest management and group selection forestry among others. He holds a degree in Biology from Reed College (B.A., 2015) where he wrote his senior thesis on the impacts of climate change on the forests of the Pacific Northwest.		

#### 1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

Number of days spent onsite for evaluation	2
Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation	1
Number of days spent by any technical experts (in addition to amount in line A)	0
Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and follow-up	2
<b>Total number of person days used in evaluation</b>	<b>4</b>

#### 1.3 Applicable Standards

All applicable FSC standards are available on the websites of FSC International ([www.fsc.org](http://www.fsc.org)) or SCS Global Services ([www.SCSglobalServices.com](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)). All standards are available on request from SCS Global Services via the comment form on our website. When no national standard exists for the country/region, SCS Interim Standards are developed by modifying SCS's Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of any Draft

Regional/National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, SCS Draft Interim Standards are provided to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, forest managers under evaluation, and the FSC National or Regional Office for comment. SCS's COC indicators for FMEs are based on the most current versions of the FSC Chain of Custody Standard, FSC Standard for Group Entities in Forest Management Groups (FSC-STD-30-005), and FSC Accreditation Requirements. "Applicable standards" are all FSC standards with which the certified entity must comply, not just the standards selected for evaluation this year.

Standards applicable <i>NOTE: Please include the full standard name and Version number and check all that apply based on type of certificate.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Stewardship Standard(s), including version: FSC-US Forest Management Standard (V1.0, 8 July 2010)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Trademark Standard (FSC-STD-50-001 V2-0)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCS COC indicators for FMEs, V8-0
	<input type="checkbox"/> FSC standard for group entities in forest management groups (FSC-STD-30-005), V1-1
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

### 1.4 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units

Length Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Mile (US Statute)	Kilometer (km)	1.609347
Foot (ft.)	Meter (m)	0.3048
Yard (yd.)	Meter (m)	0.9144
Area Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Square foot (sq. ft.)	Square meter (m <sup>2</sup> )	0.09290304
Acre (ac)	Hectare (ha)	0.4047
Volume Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Cubic foot (cu ft.)	Cubic meter (m <sup>3</sup> )	0.02831685
Gallon (gal)	Liter (l)	4.546
Quick reference		
1 acre	= 0.404686 ha	
1,000 acres	= 404.686 ha	
1 board foot	= 0.00348 cubic meters	
1,000 board feet	= 3.48 cubic meters	
1 cubic foot	= 0.028317 cubic meters	

## 2. Certification Evaluation Process

### 2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes

<b>Date:</b> 2 June 2021	
<b>FMU / location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>

<p>Opening meeting, CAF offices, Chester, CA</p>	<p>Introductions, client update, review scope of evaluation, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards, confidentiality and public summary, conformance evaluation methods and tools, review of open CARs/OBS, emergency and security procedures for evaluation team, final site selection.</p>
<p>Site 1: Various Harvest Units, Cow Creek THP, Wolf Creek Tract</p>	<p>Speed limit signs present on haul roads, many of which had been installed in response to a corrective action issued in 2019; these signs are intended to remind log truck drivers, CAF personnel, and the public of the need to control speed on forest roads. CAF allows public access on the FMU, and several new gates have been installed on the FMU to manage that access and protect resources.</p> <p>Operated in Cow Creek THP last year. Audit Team observed several units: completed, in process, and marked. The units were a combination of individual tree selection and small groups. The largest group opening was 1.2 acres, which is below the 2.5-acre maximum as required by the California Forest Practice Rules (CFPR). The boundary of each group opening was clearly marked with orange flagging. Leave trees were marked with photosensitive paint to minimize the long-term impact to aesthetics. A common silvicultural goal for the units observed was to improve the stand quality, which included removing decadent white fir.</p> <p>Units in process had top piles on the landings, which in most cases will be chipped for biomass. Slash was packed around the landings, limiting erosion. Haul roads in the THP were in good condition; many were graveled, and all observed roads were properly graded and showed no sign of erosion. In unit areas where operations were complete, logging trails had properly constructed water bars.</p> <p>The Audit Team visited the Gill Pond drafting site. CAF uses drafting sites in accordance with the company’s Master Agreement for Timber Operations (MATO), which is required by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Water levels at drafting sites must be monitored, and the intake valve screened. Additionally, amphibian surveys occur during the breeding season prior to using the drafting pond to determine if any rare species are present. Also in accordance with the MATO, Gill Pond has a brow log and a gravel pad for the water truck.</p>

<p>Site 2: Watercourse Crossing, Cow Creek &amp; Tunnel THPs, Wolf Creek Tract</p>	<p>Rocked ford crossing of a Class 3 watercourse at border of Cow Creek and Tunnel THPs. The stream, colloquially known as Suez Canal, was dry at the time of the audit. In order to minimize streamside erosion, rip-rap has been installed along the stream in the vicinity of the crossing. While there was exposed soil along the stream upstream of the crossing, the crossing itself was well protected with no sign of erosion.</p> <p>An adjacent unit in the Tunnel THP is marked to cut for selection.</p>
<p>Site 3: Various Management Units, Rock Creek THP</p>	<p>In response to a corrective action that was issued in last year (<b>Finding 2020.2</b>), CAF developed a new protocol for cultural resource field markings. In active units, the new marking system alerts operators to contact the RFP managing the THP. An example of this new marking system, which includes placards and flagging, was observed by the Audit Team.</p> <p>CAF secured a California Climate Investments grant from CAL FIRE to support forest health improvement projects, including meadow restoration. The Audit Team observed one such site at which encroaching conifers had recently been removed to facilitate restoration of a meadow system. The restoration site is 85 acres in size and, as of the time of the audit, two-thirds was complete. The meadow contains a Class 1 watercourse, and conifers had encroached in the riparian area. Both the edge of the meadow and the riparian zone were marked for the operator. While the goal of the project was to significantly open up the stand to benefit the meadow system, CAF maintained its policy of retaining two of the largest individual trees of each species represented on the site. As part of the restoration project, CAF has been conducting surveys of birds and other wildlife, as well as plant surveys, to monitor changes.</p> <p>20 giant sequoia trees had been planted along the edge of the meadow restoration area; although the trees are not native to this part of California, the species is not invasive and there is no risk of spread.</p>
<p>Site 4: Watercourse Crossing, 240 Road, Sunflower THP</p>	<p>Culverted crossing of a dry Class 3 watercourse. The 24-inch diameter galvanized steel pipe had been installed in 2017. The culvert had been properly installed and was in good condition. There was no sign of perching or erosion. The 240 Road also had rolling dips to manage waterflow during the rainy season.</p>

<p>Site 5: Water Drafting Site, Sunflower THP</p>	<p>Well maintained pond drafting site. There was a large graveled pad for the water truck with 3-inch aggregate. A brow log was also installed. The drafting hose in the pond had a mesh screen to prevent the intake of amphibians and debris. These are all requirements of the MATO.</p>
<p>Site 6: Herbicide Application, Edge Cabin THP</p>	<p>In advance of a planned harvest unit, undergrowth was sprayed in 2019. Glyphosate and Imazapyr were applied with backpack sprayers to control manzanita and other competing vegetation, with good success. A state-licensed pesticide applicator had been contracted for this work.</p> <p>The unit will be cut this year and planted in the fall. Spraying units prior to harvest facilitates site prep for planting, with the logging equipment breaking down the dead vegetation during operations. Operators are provided with both paper and electronic maps denoting unit boundaries, protected areas, and prescriptions.</p> <p>Another cultural resource protection site was observed by the Audit Team. It is flagged, but not yet tagged with a placard.</p>
<p>Site 7: Eagle Nests, Chester Flats, Old Hwy. 89</p>	<p>Two occupied bald eagle nest sites permanently are marked on the ground and on GPS. A 10-acre protection area has been established around the nests; the buffer also includes several perch trees. On the road adjacent to the nests, the speed limit is 10 MPH and no jake-breaks are allowed, per signage. Additionally, there are no operations in the vicinity during the critical nesting period.</p>
<p>Site 8: HCV, Rock Lake, Chester Flats THP 2-18-062 Plumas</p>	<p>13-acre unentered stand adjacent to Rock Lake. Stand is comprised of late seral pine with white fir component; much of the white fir is becoming decadent with forked tops, snags, and coarse woody debris. An osprey nest was observed. Rock Lake is natural with planted fish, although it is nearly dry this year. HCV runs length of lake. Nearby stands of aspen, primarily around springs. Monitoring involves visiting the site frequently and ensuring that boundaries remain in place. The lake and adjoining HCV is adjacent to Main Road 2, so there is good access for monitoring using photo points. Water drafting spot also present. Recreation camp site at far end of lake is used frequently. Riparian buffer between road and lake.</p>
<p><b>Date:</b> 2 June 2021</p>	
<p><b>FMU / location / sites visited</b></p>	<p><b>Activities / notes</b></p>
<p>Site 9: Meadow Restoration, Marion THP</p>	<p>Similar to the restoration activities described for Site 3, this particular project aims to address conifer encroachment on a</p>



	<p>meadow system. It is part of the management activities that were conducted as part of implementing the THP. The project occurred in approximately 2017. Monitoring includes measuring water level recharge levels, which are anticipated to increase with the removal of conifers.</p> <p>Reforestation in THP harvest units in 2017 included planting giant sequoia (less than 10% of the total seedlings planted). Although the trees are not native to this part of California, the species is not invasive and there is no risk of spread. Seedlings were planted relatively far apart because natural regeneration is expected.</p>
<p>Site 10: Onion Ridge Fuel Break, Main Road 1, Lassen Tract</p>	<p>22-mile fuel break created along mainline road, which generally follows a ridgeline. These types of extensive fuel reduction projects are intended to reduce the intensity of a landscape-scale conflagration, as well as minimize the chance that a human-caused fire along the road becomes established.</p>
<p>Site 11: Lassen Trail Historical Site</p>	<p>Historic emigrant trail that crosses public and private land, including CAF. The trail was used by gold seekers and others who emigrated to California in the mid-1800s. The wagon trail grade is still evident, and the National Historical Trail is marked.</p>
<p>Site 12: Active Harvest Site, Round Valley THP, Area 2</p>	<p>Individual tree selection unit intended to improve stand quality through removal of mistletoe infected trees and poorly formed stems. WLPZ buffer established, which is aimed at protecting the Cascades frog, which was detected at the site. Unit also contains cultural resource sites, which have been flagged for the operator. Thorough utilization, with low stump height and extraction of all marketable logs.</p> <p>Timbco harvester with hand falling of oversize material. Operator has pre-positioned large, gas powered water tanks in unit for fire protection. On the landing, the harvester was inoperable due to repairs being made (replacing hydraulic hose); landing is clean with no sign of fluid leaks. Audit Team reviewed completed load ticket (Ticket No. 166201); the load ticket doesn't contain the FSC claim or certificate code, as that is found on the logger contract.</p> <p>Interview with operator confirms training; presence of spill and First-aid kits, fire extinguishers, fire tools, and paper and electronic operational maps. The operator verified that there is regular communication with the FME's forester.</p>

<p>Site 13: Childs Meadow THP</p>	<p>THP includes area under conservation easement held by The Nature Conservancy. CAF owns the timber rights on the conservation easement. The THP includes two areas with timber (1,300 acres and 800 acres) and two meadows (430 acres and 67 acres). The meadows area important for both wildlife and cattle grazing. The Cascades frog is present in the meadows, as is the willow flycatcher. Meadows are primarily comprised of native grasses, but CAF acknowledges that grazing can bring in invasive plants. The current grazing lease is for 3 years; the meadows will be grazed this year, with some monitoring of grazing levels. Several grants have been secured to support management in the THP, including for THP planning and meadow restoration. Childs Meadow THP operational maps were reviewed by the Audit Team.</p>
<p>Site 14: Completed Salvage Operation, Stone Fire</p>	<p>In August 2020, the Stone Fire burned 118 acres on the CAF FMU. This particular site burned 75 acres. Of this, 30 acres were salvaged in an area that burned the hottest. Site prep has occurred in the harvested area this year, with planting of ponderosa and sugar pines occurring along the primary access road for the unit. Planting will be completed in the fall. It is a dry, southwestern-facing site so monitoring of seedling survival will be important.</p>
<p>Site 15: Chemical Storage Facility, Chester, CA</p>	<p>Locked storage area located on the premises of the Collins Almanor Mill. Inventory is labeled, and there are Material Safety Data Sheets. Backpack sprayers have been double rinsed for storage. No unmarked chemicals nor empty bottles are stored in the facility. These observations are consistent with state requirements and FSC standards.</p>
<p>Document review, interviews</p>	<p>Staff interviews and document review.</p>
<p>Closing meeting prep</p>	<p>Audit Team consolidated notes and confirmed preliminary evaluation findings</p>
<p>Closing meeting</p>	<p>Brief summary of audit activities, presented preliminary findings, confidentiality, SCS/FSC dispute policy, timeline for report, and discussed next steps.</p>

## 2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies. Evaluation methods include reviewing documents and records, interviewing FME personnel and contractors, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observing implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and collecting and analyzing stakeholder input. When there is more than one team member, each member may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an

evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant field observations, interviews, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus among team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section and/or in observations.

### 3. Changes in Management Practices

- There were no significant changes in the management and/or harvesting methods that affect the FME’s conformance to the FSC standards and policies.
- Significant changes occurred since the last evaluation that may affect the FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies (*describe*):

### 4. Results of Evaluation

#### 4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations

*Major CARs:* Major nonconformances, either alone or in combination with nonconformances of all other applicable indicators, result (or are likely to result) in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the relevant FSC Criterion given the uniqueness and fragility of each forest resource. These are corrective actions that must be resolved or closed out before a certificate can be awarded. If Major CARs arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these nonconformances is typically shorter than for Minor CARs. Certification is contingent on the certified FME’s response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

*Minor CARs:* These are corrective action requests in response to minor nonconformances, which are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Most Minor CARs are the result of nonconformance at the indicator-level. Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate.

*Observations:* These are subject areas where the evaluation team concludes that there is conformance, but either future nonconformance may result due to inaction or the FME could achieve exemplary status through further refinement. Action on observations is voluntary and does not affect the maintenance of the certificate. However, observations can become CARs if performance with respect to the indicator(s) triggering the observation falls into nonconformance.

#### 4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period

FM Principle	Cert/Re-cert Evaluation 2018	1 <sup>st</sup> Annual Evaluation 2019	2 <sup>nd</sup> Annual Evaluation 2020	3 <sup>rd</sup> Annual Evaluation 2021	4 <sup>th</sup> Annual Evaluation 2023
No findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P1			Minor 1.1.a		
P2					

P3					
P4	Minor 4.2.b	Minor 4.2.b			
P5	OBS 5.1.a, OBS 5.3.a				
P6	OBS 6.3.f	OBS 6.3.h	OBS 6.3.h, OBS 6.6.a & 6.6.e	OBS 6.6.a & 6.6.e	
P7					
P8					
P9					
P10					
COC for FM					
Trademark					
Group					
Other					

### 4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2020.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU): NA	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0, 8 July 2010), Indicator 6.3.h

<p><b>Background:</b>                  During the 2019 annual surveillance audit, it was determined that although elements of 6.3.h are being implemented by FME, there lacks a comprehensive and systematic approach for identifying and treating invasive plant populations, and that invasives monitoring is not part of reforestation or inventory. As a result, an OBS was issued (see <b>Finding 2019.2</b>).</p> <p>In response to the finding, FME developed <i>Collins Almanor Forest Invasive Plant Species Management Plan Planning Document</i> (dated 6 July 2020). The planning document describes the rationale for creating an invasive plant species management plan, its scope, known invasive species to occur on the FMU, survey and control methods, invasive plant management objectives, management plan development, and informational needs and additional steps required for each of these elements. An interview in 2020 with FME wildlife biologist, who authored the planning document, confirmed that invasive species that exist on the FMU and on neighboring ownerships are presently being catalogued and that a process for identifying priority areas for treatment is being developed. These activities, combined with the planning document, will guide the development of a strategy for invasive plant species management on the FMU.</p> <p>Although a strategy for invasive plant species management is still in development, the FME does implement measures to prevent or control invasive species, thereby demonstrating conformance to Indicator 6.3. However, with the increase in the size and number of group openings as a silvicultural practice, it is the Auditor’s assessment that there remains an opportunity to expand identification and control of invasive plant populations by finalizing and beginning to implement the invasive species strategy, thereby warranting keeping the OBS open as <b>Finding 2020.1</b>.</p>	
<p><b>Observation:</b>                  FME should finalize and begin to implement its <i>Invasive Plant Species Management Plan</i> as part of assessing the risk of, prioritizing, and, as warranted, developing and implementing a strategy to prevent or control invasive species.</p>	
<p><b>FME response</b>                  (including any evidence submitted)</p>	<p>CAF completed an invasive plant management plan that we will provide during the audit.</p>
<p><b>SCS review</b></p>	<p>The Audit Team reviewed the <i>Collins Almanor Forest Invasive Plant Species Guidance Document</i> (V1, 31 March 2021). The document had been updated since the 2020 annual surveillance evaluation. As verified through conversations with FME personnel and field site visits, the FME has transitioned to the implementation phase of the plan. Since the guidance document has been finalized and is beginning to be implemented, closure of the Observation is warranted.</p>
<p><b>Status of CAR:</b></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed  <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major  <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

<b>Finding Number: 2020.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU): NA	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0, 8 July 2010), Indicator 1.1.a
<p><b>Non-Conformity:</b>            In 2020, CAL FIRE issued a notice of violation. The LTO had backed a piece of equipment into a designated cultural site at Spud THP (No. 2-18-053 TEH). The issued violation is considered a “paper violation,” which establishes a written record of the incident; CAL FIRE chose not to prepare a civil or criminal case.</p> <p>FME personnel reported this violation to Certification Body (CB) during this year’s evaluation, as required by Indicator 1.1.a. Currently, FME is testing methods to permanently mark cultural or other sites of significance on the FMU to more clearly alert LTOs to areas requiring site-specific protection measures without disclosing the specific resource value at the sites themselves.</p> <p>While the incident was determined by the state to be a violation of the California Forest Practice Rules, it appears to be an isolated case with no sign of a systemic problem. Additionally, the violation was immediately disclosed to CB as part of the 2020 evaluation, and FME is actively looking for solutions make areas requiring site-specific protection measures, including cultural sites, more visible to operators. For these reasons, it is the Auditor’s assessment that a finding graded as a Minor is justified.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request:</b>            Forest management plans and operations shall demonstrate compliance with all applicable federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal laws, and administrative requirements (e.g., regulations).</p>	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	CAF implemented cultural resource field marking changes, examples will be observed during the audit.
<b>SCS review</b>	<p>During the site visits, the Audit Team verified the implementation of the new cultural resource field markings in at least one harvest unit. Additionally, the Audit Team verified that no violations have been issued to LTOs or RPFs working on the FMU in the past year. This evidence warrants closure of the finding.</p> <p>The 2022 audit team is encouraged to examine additional cultural resource field markings to ensure the ongoing implementation of the new cultural resource field marking protocol (see audit report <i>Appendix 4—Required Tracking: Special Instructions or Scoping Notes for Next Regularly Scheduled Annual Audit</i>).</p>
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision <i>(refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number: 2020.3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU): NA	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0), Indicators 6.6.a & 6.6.e
<p><b>Background:</b>                  Power utility and gas companies have easements allowing them to control vegetation in powerline corridors and above gas transmission pipelines that traverse the FMU. During interviews with Auditor, FME personnel stated that there is no sign that herbicides have been applied in these areas.</p> <p>FSC recently released an interpretation clarifying that “a right-of-way or other easement that is located within the boundaries of a certified MU is subject to FSC pesticide reporting. The names and quantities of pesticides applied, and size of area treated must be included in the certificate holder’s certification report summary of quantitative pesticides data. If the areas are excised from the scope of the certificate following FSC-POL-20-003, then the certificate holder is not required to report pesticide application in these areas” (INT-STD-20-2007a_03, dated 3 April 2020).</p> <p>FSC requires FME to ensure that no products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (Indicator 6.6.a) and that chemical use on the FMU is monitored (Indicator 6.6.e). FME has not requested information on herbicide applications from easement holders, nor has it placed chemical use restrictions on those easement holders. While there is no sign that herbicides have been applied in these areas, an OBS has been raised since there is not a mechanism to collect this information in the event that herbicide application occurs in the future, thereby risking a future non-conformity.</p>	
<p><b>Observation:</b>                  FME must ensure that no products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used on the FMU. For chemicals that are used, the effects must be monitored and the results used for adaptive management. Additionally, records must be kept of pest occurrences, control measures, and incidences of worker exposure to chemicals applied on the FMU.</p>	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	CAF has been monitoring communications from third parties that are required to notify underlying landowners of herbicide use on their lands. CAF has not received notifications of third party herbicide use on CAF land.

<b>SCS review</b>	<p>Through discussions with FME personnel, the Audit Team learned that there are several entities that are required to notify landowners of pesticide use. These include the state transportation agency, public power utility, and county governments. As explained in the FME response and reiterated during interviews, the FME has not received notification from these entities of using pesticides on rights-of-ways or easements they hold on company lands.</p> <p>Ongoing monitoring of communications about pesticide use from entities that are required to notify the FME is important and should continue. However, to ensure full conformance the FME should also ensure that it reports chemical use by any third parties who are not presently required to report such chemical use, if any.</p> <p>Consequently, the Observation remains open (see <b>Finding 2021.1</b>).</p>
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

#### 4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2021.1</b>	
<b>Finding and Deadline</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR:</b> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR:</b> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Minor CAR:</b> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit, whichever comes first ( <i>surveillance or re-evaluation</i> ) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation</b> – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b> and deadline (specify):	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Standard and Indicator</b>	FSC-US Forest Management Standard (v1.0), Indicators 6.6.a & 6.6.e
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Non-Conformity Evidence</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation Justification and/or Explanation</b> Power utility and gas companies have easements allowing them to control vegetation in powerline corridors, above gas transmission pipelines, and potentially on other areas on the FMU. During interviews with the Audit Team in 2020, FME personnel stated that is no sign that herbicides have been applied in these areas nor information that herbicides have been applied.  Following issuance of an Observation ( <b>Finding 2020.3</b> ), the 2021 Audit Team learned that there are several entities that are required to notify the FME of pesticide use. These include the state transportation agency, public power utility, and county governments. As explained in the FME response above and reiterated in interviews during the 2021 surveillance audit, the FME has not received notification from these entities of using pesticides on rights-of-ways or easements they hold on company lands. However, presently there is not a mechanism to collect pesticide use from third parties that are not presently required to report such chemical use, if any.  While there is no sign that pesticides have been applied on rights-of-way or other easements on the FMU held by others, there is not a comprehensive mechanism to collect this information from all	



third-parties in the event that pesticide application occurs in the future, thereby risking a future non-conformity.	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Non-Conformity Corrective Action Request</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation; no Corrective Action is required</b> To ensure that no products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (Indicator 6.6.a) and that chemical use on the FMU is monitored (Indicator 6.6.e), the FME should seek information on pesticide use by all third parties, including those that are not presently required to report such chemical use, if any. Information on pesticides use must include the pesticides applied, volume applied, and area of application and be reported to FSC annually.	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

## 5. Stakeholder Comments

In accordance with SCS protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. Distinct purposes of such consultation include:

- To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME’s management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the FME and the surrounding communities.
- To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based on the three FSC chambers, as well as the SCS Interim Standard, if one was used.

### 5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from past evaluations, lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources. Stakeholder groups who are consulted as part of the evaluation include FME management and staff, consulting foresters, contractors, lease holders, adjacent property owners, local and regionally-based social interest and civic organizations, purchasers of logs harvested on FME forestlands, recreational user groups, tribal members and/or representatives, members of the FSC National Initiative, members of the regional FSC working group, FSC International, local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists, and forest industry groups and organizations, as well as local, state, and federal regulatory agency personnel and other relevant groups.

## 5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses

The table below summarizes the comments falling within scope of the standard received from stakeholders and the assessment team’s response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties (who are not members of the enterprise under evaluation) as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual evaluation.</i>	
<b>Summary of Outreach Activities Conducted (Check all that apply):</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Face to face meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Phone calls <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email, or letter <input type="checkbox"/> Notice published in the national and/or local press <input type="checkbox"/> Notice published on relevant websites <input type="checkbox"/> Local radio announcements <input type="checkbox"/> Local customary notice boards <input type="checkbox"/> Social media broadcast	
Stakeholder Comment (Negative, positive, and neutral)	SCS Response
Numerous positive comments from contractors about it being a positive experience to work with CAF personnel. Specifically, contractors noted that company personnel are good communicators; for example, foresters who administer sales regularly visit active operations and are always accessible via cell phone if questions arise.	Duly noted; no response required.
“I am favorably impressed with their commitment to managing the resource for ecological services and sustainability.”	Duly noted; no response required.
“I am always impressed with their land stewardship...Collins interests not only lie in healthy trees, but healthy meadows as well. They have spent a considerable amount of capital, investing in meadows that are located on their lands, or adjacent meadows that they have timber rights on.”	This comment is consistent with site visits to meadow systems and data reviewed during the audit and represents evidence of conformance for Indicators 6.3.a.2 and 6.3.c.
State wildlife regulators explained that the inspections they have conducted and their interactions with company representatives “have all been positive.”	Duly noted; no response required.

## 6. Certification Decision

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Council standards. The SCS annual evaluation team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual evaluations and the FME’s response to any open CARs.	<b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---

**Comments:** CAF is a well-managed forest with highly committed and capable personnel dedicated to implementing management consistent with the FSC standards.

## 7. Annual Data Update

<input type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous evaluation.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information in the following sections has changed since previous evaluation.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Name and Contact Information <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales Information <input type="checkbox"/> Scope of Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SLIMF FMUs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pesticide and Other Chemical Use <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Production Forests <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Product Classification <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation & High Conservation Value Areas <input type="checkbox"/> Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification

### Name and Contact Information

<b>Organization name</b>	Collins Pine Company – Collins Almanor Forest		
<b>Contact person</b>	Niel Fischer, Forest Manager		
<b>Address</b>	PO Box 796	<b>Telephone</b>	(530) 258-4401
	Chester, CA 96020	<b>Fax</b>	(530) 258-4266
	USA	<b>e-mail</b>	<a href="mailto:nfischer@collinsco.com">nfischer@collinsco.com</a>
		<b>Website</b>	<a href="http://www.collinswood.com">http://www.collinswood.com</a>

### FSC Sales Information

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales contact information same as above.			
<b>FSC salesperson</b>	-		
<b>Address</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	-	
	<b>Fax</b>	-	
	<b>e-mail</b>	-	
	<b>Website</b>	-	
	<b>Website</b>		

### Scope of Certificate

<b>Certificate Type</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group	
<b>SLIMF (if applicable)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
<b># Group Members (if applicable)</b>	NA	
<b>Number of FMUs in scope of certificate</b>	1	
<b>Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)</b>	Latitude & Longitude: N/S 121 degrees 49 minutes	
<b>Forest zone</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate

		<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
<b>Area in scope of certificate which is:</b>		<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac	
privately managed	95,300		
state managed	-		
community managed	-		
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate</b> <i>(Is also equal to [productive area] + [conservation area])</i>	95,300		
<b>Prior year total forest area in scope of certificate</b> <i>(from prior year report)</i>	95,300		
<b>Has Total forest area changed from prior year?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Change from prior year <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, there was a change from prior year. Explain change: <i>Explain any change. Example: GIS recalculations, land acquisition/divestiture</i>		
<b>Number of FMUs in scope that are:</b>			
less than 100 ha in area	-	100 - 1000 ha in area	-
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	-	more than 10 000 ha in area	1
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:</b>		<b>Units:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac	
are less than 100 ha in area	-		
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	-		
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	-		
<b>Division of FMUs into manageable units:</b>			
FMU is divided until stand-level management units.			

**Non-SLIMF FMUs (Group or Multiple FMU Certificates)**

Name	Contact information	Latitude/ longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs	
NA	NA	NA	NA

**Social Information**

<b>Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):</b>		
Male workers: 6	Female workers: 4	
<b>Number of accidents in forest work since previous evaluation:</b>	Serious: 0	Fatal: 0

**Pesticide and Other Chemical Use**

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A - FME has not used pesticides since last audit.</i>				
Commercial name of	Active ingredient	Quantity applied since previous	Total area treated since previous	Reason for use

pesticide / herbicide		evaluation (kg or lbs.)	evaluation (ha or ac)	
Velpar DF	Hexazinone	220 lbs. (3.14 lbs./acre)	70 acres	Applied as a site prep (pre-emergent) application to improve seedling survival by lowering initial vegetation competition within a recent wildfire rehabilitation site (Stump Fire 2020)

**Production Forests**

<b>Timber Forest Products</b>	<b>Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac</b>
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	95,300
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	-
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	-
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	95,300
<b>Silvicultural system(s)</b>	<b>Area under type of management</b>
Even-aged management	-
Clearcut (clearcut size range: NA)	-
Shelterwood	-
Other:	-
Uneven-aged management	-
Individual tree selection	-
Group selection	-
Other: Combination of individual tree and group selection	95,300
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	-
<b>Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)</b>	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	-
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	-
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	-
<b>Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)</b>	
<i>Pinus ponderosa</i> ponderosa pine <i>Pinus lambertiana</i> sugar pine <i>Pinus contorta</i> lodgepole pine <i>Pinus jeffreyi</i> Jeffrey pine <i>Pinus monticola</i> western white pine	

<p><i>Abies concolor</i> white fir  <i>Abies magnifica</i> red fir  <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> Douglas-fir  <i>Calocedrus decurrens</i> incense-cedar  <i>Sequoiadendron giganteum</i> Giant sequoia</p>
--

**FSC Product Classification\***

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1	W1.1 Roundwood logs	All
W1	W1.2 Fuel Wood	All
W3	W3.1 Wood Chips	All
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species
NA	NA	NA

\*Note: W1, W2, and W3 product groups usually do not require a separate evaluation to FSC-STD-40-004 (COC) if processing occurs in the field for FM/COC and CW/FM certificate types. N1-N10 (NTFPs) are eligible to be sold with FSC claims under FM/COC certification if reported here. Bamboo and NTFPs derived from trees (e.g. cork, resin, bark) may be eligible for FM/COC and CW/FM certification. NTFPs used for food and medicinal purposes are not eligible for CW/FM certification. Check with SCS if you have any products intended to be sold with an FSC claim outside of any of these categories.

**Conservation and High Conservation Value Areas**

Conservation Area	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
<b>Total amount</b> of land in certified area protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives (includes both forested and non-forested lands).*	8,822 ac (includes 657 ac of RSA)

\*Note: Total conservation and HCV areas may differ since these may serve different functions in the FME's management system. Designation as HCV may allow for active management, including commercial harvest. Conservation areas are typically under passive management, but may undergo invasive species control, prescribed burns, non-commercial harvest, and other management activities intended to maintain or enhance their integrity. In all cases, figures are reported by the FME as it pertains local laws & regulations, management objectives, and FSC requirements.

High Conservation Value Forest / Areas			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Fens, Vernal Pools, Childs Meadow Conservation Easement (CE), Lake Almanor Important Bird Area (IBA)	3,927
HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	Sierran Mixed Conifer, 4 stands distributed across the CAF; Montane hardwood conifer	992

HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Aspen, Late seral forest, Serpentine/Ultramafic	751
HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Montane Riparian, distributed throughout the CAF; Wet Meadow	2,511
HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).	-	-
HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).	-	-
<b>Total area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'</b>			<b>8,181</b>

**Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision)**

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the certificate holder is included in the scope.</i>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Certificate holder owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Certificate holder wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.</i>	
<b>Note:</b> <i>Excision cannot be applied to CW/FM certificates.</i>	
<b>Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:</b>	Collins Companies also owns and manages the Lakeview, Oregon and Kane, Pennsylvania forests. Both are FSC-certified and outside the scope of the evaluation of Collins Almanor Forest.
<b>Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):</b>	There is no risk of mixing certified and non-certified material on the FMU. Wood harvested from CAF land is 100% FSC-certified. No processing occurs before ownership transfers. Material harvested offsite is not transported to the FMU.
<b>Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:</b>	
<b>Name of FMU or Stand</b>	<b>Location (city, state, country)</b> <b>Size ( <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac )</b>
Lakeview Forest	Lakeview, Oregon, USA      96,836
Kane Forest	Kane, Pennsylvania, USA      117,962

## SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

### Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected for Evaluation

- FME consists of a single FMU  
 FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

SCS staff establish the design and level of sampling prior to each group or multiple FMU evaluation according to FSC-STD-20-007. A list of the FMUs sampled and the rationale behind their selection is listed below.

FMU Name	FMU Size Category:	Forest Type:	Rationale for Selection:
	- SLIMF - non-SLIMF - Large > 10,000 ha	- Plantation - Natural Forest	- Random Sample - Stakeholder issue - Ease of access - Other (please describe)
NA	NA	NA	NA

### Appendix 2 – Staff and Stakeholders Consulted

#### List of FME Staff Consulted

To protect privacy, only FME staff who have expressly provided written permission are listed. **These records are retained by SCS and subject to FSC or ASI examination.**

Name	Title	Contact Information	Consultation method
Niel Fischer	Forest Manager	<a href="mailto:NFischer@CollinsCo.com">NFischer@CollinsCo.com</a>	In person
Galen Smith	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:gsmith@collinsco.com">gsmith@collinsco.com</a>	In person
Bethany Johnson	Staff Biologist	<a href="mailto:BJohnson@CollinsCo.com">BJohnson@CollinsCo.com</a>	In person
Robert Howe	Procurement Forester	<a href="mailto:rhowe@collinsco.com">rhowe@collinsco.com</a>	In person
Eric O’Kelley	District Forester	<a href="mailto:NFischer@CollinsCo.com">NFischer@CollinsCo.com</a>	In person
Corey Bingaman	Lands Forester	<a href="mailto:NFischer@CollinsCo.com">NFischer@CollinsCo.com</a>	In person
Glen Gerbatz	District Forester	<a href="mailto:NFischer@CollinsCo.com">NFischer@CollinsCo.com</a>	In person
Andy Juska	District Forester	<a href="mailto:NFischer@CollinsCo.com">NFischer@CollinsCo.com</a>	In person

#### List of other Stakeholders Consulted\*

To protect privacy, only stakeholders who have expressly provided written permission are listed. **These records are retained by SCS and subject to FSC or ASI examination.**

Name	Title	Contact Information	Consultation method	Requests Stakeholder Notification? (Y/N)
Leslie Mink	Project Manager, Plumas Corporation	leslie@plumascorporation.org	Email	N



Withheld to protect confidentiality	Conservation District	-	Email	N
Withheld to protect confidentiality	Regulator	-	Email	N
Withheld to protect confidentiality	Operator	-	In person interview	N
Withheld to protect confidentiality	LTO	-	In person interview	N

\* Note: SCS may maintain additional records of stakeholder consultation activities (e.g., email notifications) in its recordkeeping system. Anonymous stakeholders may have provided comments as a part of stakeholder outreach activities, such communications are retained by SCS subject to FSC and ASI examination.

### Appendix 3 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed

- None.
- Additional techniques employed (*describe*):

### Appendix 4 – Required Tracking

#### Pesticide Derogations

- There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.

Name of pesticide / herbicide (active ingredient)		Date derogation approved
NA		NA
Condition	Conformance (C / NC)	Evidence of progress
NA	NA	NA

#### Progressive HCVF Assessments

- FME does not use partial or progressive HCVF assessments.\*

\*Note: In the case the FME is not operating in the entire management unit, it is permissible to only complete an HCVF assessment for the portion of the unit in which they are operating under special conditions. In such cases, the HCVF assessment must be extended if new areas are entered without an existing, appropriate HCVF assessment having been completed. An example includes a large forest concession where harvesting is initially limited to a smaller geographic scope.

<b>Partial or progressive HCV must be noted in SCS tracking system for monitoring. Describe below the FME monitoring plan to ensure additional HCVF assessments are completed as necessary:</b>
NA

#### Special Instructions or Scoping Notes for Next Regularly Scheduled Annual Audit

<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable; no significant issues identified that may impact the next audit.
--------------------------	--

Some issues were identified during this audit that the next audit team could consider in the next audit, such as:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scope of certificate:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Audit sampling:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Audit time:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Audit season:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Travel time between sites or FMUs:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Audit frequency:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Suggested audit team competency for next audit:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Suggested requirements to include during the next audit:  The 2022 audit team is encouraged to examine additional cultural resource field markings to ensure the ongoing implementation of the new cultural resource field marking protocol as part of evaluating conformance with Indicator 1.1.a (see <b>Finding 2020.2</b> ).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Suggested issues investigate during the next audit:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Suggested sites for inspection:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Stakeholders to be consulted:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other(s) – please describe:

\*Note: information audit team leaders wish to remain confidential may be communicated directly to SCS.

## Appendix 5 – Forest Management Standard Conformance Table

Criteria required by FSC at every surveillance evaluation ( <i>check all situations that apply</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/> NA – all FMUs are exempt from these requirements. <input type="checkbox"/> Plantations > 10,000 ha (24,710 ac): 2.3, 4.2, 4.4, 6.7, 6.9, 10.6, 10.7, and 10.8 <input type="checkbox"/> Natural forests > 50,000 ha (123,553 ac) ('low intensity' SLIMFs exempt): 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 8.2, and 9.4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FMUs containing High Conservation Values ('small forest' SLIMFs exempt): 6.2, 6.3, 6.9 and 9.4
Documents and records reviewed for FMUs/sites sampled	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All applicable documents and records described in the audit plan were reviewed; or <input type="checkbox"/> The following documents and records described in the audit plan were NOT reviewed ( <i>provide explanation</i> ):

### Requirements Reviewed in Annual Evaluation

Evaluation Year	Requirements Reviewed (FSC P&C Reviewed, FM/COC Indicators, Trademark Indicators, Group Standard Indicators, etc.)
2018	All – (Re)certification Evaluation
2019	6.2, 6.3, 6.9 and 9.4; P.1, P.4, P.5

2020	FSC Forest Management Principles 2 and 7; required FM Indicators listed above (6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 8.2, and 9.4), FM Indicator 4.2.b; and the FSC Trademark Standard.
2021	FM Principles 3 and 8; FM Indicators 6.2, 6.3, 6.6, 6.7, 6.9, and 9.4; COC for FMEs; and Trademark Standard.
2022	-

C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator  
 NC= Nonconformance with Criterion or Indicator  
 NA = Not Applicable  
 NE = Not Evaluated

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
<b>Principle #1: Compliance with Laws and FSC Principles</b> Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.		
Not evaluated.		
<b>Principle #2: Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</b>		
Not evaluated.		
<b>Principle #3: The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.</b>		
<b>3.1. Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands and territories unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.</b>	NA	CAF does not manage tribal forests, as confirmed through a review of ownership records and interviews with staff.
<b>3.1.a</b> Tribal forest management planning and implementation are carried out by authorized tribal representatives in accordance with tribal laws and customs and relevant federal laws.	NA	-
<b>3.1.b</b> The manager of a tribal forest secures, in writing, informed consent regarding forest management activities from the tribe or individual forest owner prior to commencement of those activities.	NA	-
<b>3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</b>	C	-

<p><b>3.2.a</b> During management planning, the forest owner or manager consults with American Indian groups that have legal rights or other binding agreements to the FMU to avoid harming their resources or rights.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No tribes have legal rights or binding agreements on the FMU, as confirmed through a review of ownership records and interviews with staff.</p>
<p><b>3.2.b</b> Demonstrable actions are taken so that forest management does not adversely affect tribal resources. When applicable, evidence of, and measures for, protecting tribal resources are incorporated in the management plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>When the THP process reveals archeological sites, protective buffers or other mitigations are implemented, as confirmed through a review of ownership records and sample of THPs.</p> <p>Full implementation of the cultural resource field markings, which were developed in response to a non-conformity issued last year (<b>Finding 2020.2</b>), will further help to ensure the protection of tribal resources identified in THPs.</p>
<p><b>3.3. Sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to indigenous peoples shall be clearly identified in cooperation with such peoples, and recognized and protected by forest managers.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>3.3.a.</b> The forest owner or manager invites consultation with tribal representatives in identifying sites of current or traditional cultural, archeological, ecological, economic or religious significance.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>As part of the THP planning and review process, local Native American groups are contacted in order to solicit input on potential archeological or culturally important sites.</p>
<p><b>3.3.b</b> In consultation with tribal representatives, the forest owner or manager develops measures to protect or enhance areas of special significance (see also Criterion 9.1).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Protection measures on CAF are typically limited to buffer zones, although other mitigation measures may be implemented.</p> <p>CAF staff have worked collaboratively and provided technical assistance to the Maidu Stewardship Project, a group attempting to manage neighboring land for cultural purposes (e.g., stimulating bear grass growth for traditional weaving). Although this project is not taking place on the FMU, it is an example of CAF's commitment to working with tribal representatives to support the</p>

		<p>protection or enhancement of areas of special significance.</p> <p>Full implementation of the cultural resource field markings, which were developed in response to a non-conformity issued last year (<b>Finding 2020.2</b>), will further help to ensure the protection of tribal resources identified in THPs.</p>
<p><b>3.4. Indigenous peoples shall be compensated for the application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence.</b></p>	NA	<p>No traditional knowledge is being used in forest management on the FMU, as confirmed through observation of management practices in the field and review of THPs.</p>
<p><b>3.4.a</b> The forest owner or manager identifies whether <i>traditional knowledge</i> in forest management is being used.</p>	NA	-
<p><b>3.4.b</b> When traditional knowledge is used, written protocols are jointly developed prior to such use and signed by local tribes or tribal members to protect and fairly compensate them for such use.</p>	NA	-
<p><b>3.4.c</b> The forest owner or manager respects the confidentiality of tribal traditional knowledge and assists in the protection of such knowledge.</p>	NA	-
<p><b>Principle #4: Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.</b></p> <p>Not evaluated.</p>		
<p><b>Principle #5: Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.</b></p> <p>Not evaluated.</p>		
<p><b>Principle #6: Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.</b></p>		
<p><b>6.1. Assessments of environmental impacts shall be completed -- appropriate to the</b></p>	NE	-

<p><b>scale, intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources -- and adequately integrated into management systems. Assessments shall include landscape level considerations as well as the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.</b></p>		
<p><b>6.2 Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</b></p>	C	-
<p><b>6.2.a</b> If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present.</p> <p>Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.</p>	C	<p>Per staff interviews, THP planning begins about 1 to 2 years out and involves conducting surveys for likely wildlife and plant species, including RTE species: California spotted owl, great gray owl, goshawk, amphibians, etc. Raptor nests are documented, too. The CAF biologist conducts camera surveys to monitor the presence species on the FMU, as verified through review of camera survey reports. The presence of RTE species is reported and mapped in the GIS database.</p>
<p><b>6.2.b</b> When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. <b>Conservation zones</b> and/or <b>protected areas</b> are established for RTE species, including</p>	C	<p>Management actions when RTE species are present, or assumed to be present, follows California Forest Practice Rules. Protection of RTE species and plants are outlined in the CAF SYP and individual THPs. Wildlife biologist is involved with denoting protection measures, per interview.</p>

<p>those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.</p>		
<p><b>6.2.c</b> For medium and large public forests (e.g. state forests), forest management plans and operations are designed to meet species' recovery goals, as well as landscape level biodiversity conservation goals.</p>	NA	FME does not manage public land.
<p><b>6.2.d</b> Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).</p>	C	Hunting and fishing on CAF are regulated by the State of California through permitting. CAF cooperates with CDFW and law enforcement on regarding regulation of these activities. The FMU is accessible to the public for these and other recreation activities.
<p><b>6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</b></p>	C	-
<p><b>6.3.a.</b> Landscape-scale indicators</p>	-	-
<p><b>6.3.a.1</b> The forest owner or manager maintains, enhances, and/or restores under-represented <i>successional</i> stages in the FMU that would naturally occur on the types of sites found on the FMU. Where old growth of different community types that would naturally occur on the forest are under-represented in the landscape relative to natural conditions, a portion of the forest is managed to enhance and/or restore old growth characteristics.</p>	C	<p>CAF's silviculture practices enhance late-seral stand structure by retaining old, large-diameter trees, as verified through site visits.</p> <p>Early seral stages may be under-represented in this managed forest. The CAF is predominantly using group selection openings to create more early seral types and reduce the presence of encroaching white fir, depending on site characteristics.</p> <p>CAF has also undertaken aspen and wet meadow restoration projects, as verified through site visits. Activities have included</p>

		<p>the reduction or elimination of conifers impacting aspen growth or regeneration as part of planned harvest activities.</p> <p>CAF is unique for a private ownership in terms of the elements of late seral (i.e., large old trees) that remain on the ownership.</p>
<p><b>6.3.a.2</b> When a <i>rare ecological community</i> is present, modifications are made in both the management plan and its implementation in order to maintain, restore or enhance the viability of the community. Based on the vulnerability of the existing community, <b>conservation zones</b> and/or <b>protected areas</b> are established where warranted.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The CAF has surveyed for and identified rare ecological communities throughout the FMU. These are identified in the HCV and RSA documentation. Examples of rare communities include wet meadow, aspen, and chaparral. In addition, WLPZ areas are established and protected in accordance with state law.</p>
<p><b>6.3.a.3</b> When they are present, management maintains the area, structure, composition, and processes of all <b>Type 1</b> and <b>Type 2 old growth</b>. Type 1 and 2 old growth are also protected and buffered as necessary with conservation zones, unless an alternative plan is developed that provides greater overall protection of old growth values.</p> <p>Type 1 Old Growth is protected from harvesting and road construction. Type 1 old growth is also protected from other timber management activities, except as needed to maintain the ecological values associated with the stand, including old growth attributes (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in dry forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>Type 2 Old Growth is protected from harvesting to the extent necessary to maintain the area, structures, and functions of the stand. Timber harvest in Type 2 old growth must maintain old growth structures, functions, and components including</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Type 1 and Type 2 old growth are identified, delineated and protected on the FMU. These are identified as HCV attributes and are mapped in the GIS database. Special management activities have been developed to protect and enhance conservation attributes.</p> <p>The requirements of the indicator that pertain to public lands and American Indian lands do not apply.</p>



<p>individual trees that function as refugia (see Indicator 6.3.g).</p> <p>On public lands, old growth is protected from harvesting, as well as from other timber management activities, except if needed to maintain the values associated with the stand (e.g., remove exotic species, conduct controlled burning, and thinning from below in forest types when and where restoration is appropriate).</p> <p>On American Indian lands, timber harvest may be permitted in Type 1 and Type 2 old growth in recognition of their sovereignty and unique ownership. Timber harvest is permitted in situations where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Old growth forests comprise a significant portion of the tribal ownership.</li> <li>2. A history of forest stewardship by the tribe exists.</li> <li>3. High Conservation Value Forest attributes are maintained.</li> <li>4. Old-growth structures are maintained.</li> <li>5. Conservation zones representative of old growth stands are established.</li> <li>6. Landscape level considerations are addressed.</li> <li>7. Rare species are protected.</li> </ol>		
<p><b>6.3.b</b> To the extent feasible within the size of the ownership, particularly on larger ownerships (generally tens of thousands or more acres), management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat conditions suitable for well-distributed populations of animal species that are characteristic of forest ecosystems within the landscape.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>After several years of work, a Safe Harbor Agreement for the great gray owl was signed in 2020. The agreement will benefit these and other species across the landscape-scale, while affording CAF with assurance that the CDFW will not require additional or different management activities by the CAF without its consent.</p> <p>The wildlife appendices in the SYP includes management for many species of wildlife beyond RTE species. There has been frequent consultation with CDFW on measures to</p>

		enhance and protect habitat for these species and to ensure surveys are efficient and effective.
<p><b>6.3.c</b> Management maintains, enhances and/or restores the plant and wildlife habitat of <b>Riparian Management Zones (RMZs)</b> to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) habitat for aquatic species that breed in surrounding uplands;</li> <li>b) habitat for predominantly terrestrial species that breed in adjacent <b>aquatic habitats</b>;</li> <li>c) habitat for species that use riparian areas for feeding, cover, and travel;</li> <li>d) habitat for plant species associated with riparian areas; and,</li> <li>e) stream shading and inputs of wood and leaf litter into the adjacent aquatic ecosystem.</li> </ul>	C	<p>CAF has been and continues to be involved with several meadow and aspen restoration projects. These include Marian Meadow Restoration, Lost Creek Aspen Restoration, and Childs Meadow Restoration.</p> <p>RMZs (i.e., WLPZs) are considered special management zones with specific management activities planned to maintain, restore, and enhance plant and wildlife habitat. The watershed appendices in the SYP covers all the watersheds on the FMU and addresses the specific measures in each watershed management unit. These cover all the items outlined in this indicator. Site visits confirm the implementation of these special management activities.</p>
<p><b>Stand-scale Indicators</b></p> <p><b>6.3.d</b> Management practices maintain or enhance plant species composition, distribution and frequency of occurrence similar to those that would naturally occur on the site.</p>	C	<p>CAF relies primarily on natural regeneration, although some planting occurs. Local seed sources are used to regenerate conifer stands where group selection silviculture is utilized, per staff interviews.</p> <p>CAF has increased utilization of group selection and planting to restore ponderosa pine as the dominant species in areas where the historic distribution shifted from ponderosa pine to white fir.</p> <p>Additionally, site visits showed habitat restoration activities to increase the presence of wet meadows and aspen stands.</p>
<p><b>6.3.e</b> When planting is required, a local source of known provenance is used when available and when the local source is equivalent in terms of quality, price and productivity. The use of non-local sources shall be justified, such as in situations where other management objectives (e.g. disease</p>	C	<p>Seeds are typically collected locally and grown by a local nursery.</p>

<p>resistance or adapting to climate change) are best served by non-local sources. <b>Native species</b> suited to the site are normally selected for regeneration.</p>		
<p><b>6.3.f</b> Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, <b>snags</b>, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. <b>Legacy trees</b> where present are not harvested; and</li> <li>b) vertical and horizontal complexity.</li> </ul> <p>Trees selected for <b>retention</b> are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>During field site visits, the Audit Team observed widespread use of single tree selection silviculture with retention of large live trees, particularly large live ponderosa pine and sugar pine. The Audit Team also observed designation of wildlife trees for retention.</p> <p>A “mini study” of wildlife trees on THPs was conducted a few years ago by the staff biologist pre-harvest (2015-16). The study determined that units had a wide range of size classes and species. The biologist conducts biological training of FME foresters, including wildlife tree retention practices.</p>
<p><b>6.3.g.1</b> In the Southeast, Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Pacific Coast Regions, when <b>even-aged systems</b> are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit as described in Appendix C for the applicable region.</p> <p>In the Lake States Northeast, Rocky Mountain and Southwest Regions, when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation. See Appendix C for additional regional requirements and guidance.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>No even-aged management has been completed since the last audit. This is not a normal part of the FME’s harvesting methods.</p> <p>In 2020, CAF did conduct salvage logging following the Stone Fire (Site 14). As evidenced during the site visit, the little live vegetation that remained was retained when possible.</p>

<b>PACIFIC COAST REGION (PC)</b>	-	-
<p><b>PC 6.3.g.1.a</b> Within harvest openings larger than 6 acres, 10-30% of pre-harvest basal area is retained. The levels of green-tree retention depend on such factors as: opening size, legacy trees, adjacent riparian zones, slope stability, upslope management, presence of critical refugia, and extent and intensity of harvesting across the FMU. Retention is distributed as clumps and dispersed individuals, appropriate to site conditions. Retained trees comprise a diversity of species and size classes, which includes large and old trees. Regeneration harvest blocks in even-aged stands average 40 acres or less. No individual block is larger than 60 acres.</p>	NA	-
<p><b>PC 6.3.g.1.b</b> Even-aged silviculture may be employed where: 1) native species require openings for regeneration or vigorous young-stand development, or 2) it restores the native species composition, or 3) it is needed to restore structural diversity in a landscape lacking openings while maintaining connectivity of older intact forests.</p> <p><i>Guidance: In some dry regions, retaining approximately 10 tons of debris per acre may be sufficient. In wetter regions, retaining 20 tons of debris per acre may be sufficient. Debris is well distributed spatially and by size and decay class, with a goal of at least 4 large pieces (approximately 20" diameter x 15' length) per acre. Three to 10 snags per acre (averaged over 10 acres) are maintained or recruited. Snags are well represented by size, species, and decay class.</i></p>	NA	-
<p><b>PC 6.3.g.1.c</b> Where necessary to protect against wind throw and to maintain microclimate, green trees and other vegetation are retained around snags, down</p>	NA	-

<p>woody debris, and other retention components.</p>		
<p><b>PC 6.3.g.1.d</b> Native hardwoods and understory vegetation are retained as needed to maintain and/or restore the natural mix of species and forest structure.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>PC 6.3.g.1.e</b> If regeneration harvest ages do not approach <i>culmination of mean annual increment</i> (CMAI), retention approaches the upper end of the range required in Indicator 6.3.h.1.a (above).</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>PC 6.3.g.1.f</b> No logical logging unit adjacent to a logged even-aged regeneration unit may be harvested using an even-aged regeneration method unless/until the prior even-aged regeneration unit is adequately stocked by a stand of trees in which the dominant and co-dominant trees average at least five feet tall and three years of age from the time of establishment on the site, either by planting or by natural regeneration. If the requirement to achieve adequate stocking is to be met with trees that were present at the time of harvest, there shall be a period not less than five years following the completion of operations before an adjacent even-aged regeneration harvest may occur.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>6.3.g.2</b> Under very limited situations, the landowner or manager has the option to develop a qualified plan to allow minor departure from the opening size limits described in Indicator 6.3.g.1. A qualified plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is developed by qualified experts in ecological and/or related fields (wildlife biology, hydrology, landscape ecology, forestry/silviculture).</li> <li>2. Is based on the totality of the <b>best available information</b> including peer-reviewed science regarding natural disturbance regimes for the FMU.</li> </ol>	<p>NA</p>	<p>FME has not sought departures from this opening size limit requirement.</p>

<p>3. Is spatially and temporally explicit and includes maps of proposed openings or areas.</p> <p>4. Demonstrates that the variations will result in equal or greater benefit to wildlife, water quality, and other values compared to the normal opening size limits, including for sensitive and rare species.</p> <p>5. Is reviewed by independent experts in wildlife biology, hydrology, and landscape ecology, to confirm the preceding findings.</p>		
<p><b>6.3.h</b> The forest owner or manager assesses the risk of, prioritizes, and, as warranted, develops and implements a strategy to prevent or control <i>invasive species</i>, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a method to determine the extent of invasive species and the degree of threat to native species and ecosystems;</li> <li>2. implementation of management practices that minimize the risk of invasive establishment, growth, and spread;</li> <li>3. eradication or control of established invasive populations when feasible: and, monitoring of control measures and management practices to assess their effectiveness in preventing or controlling invasive species.</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>Surveys for invasive species are conducted as a part of regular field operations (e.g., cruising, road monitoring, CFI updates. Few examples of invasive species have been found on the FMU, although when invasives are located a specific plan is developed to address the invasive species control and management.</p> <p>In the last two years, CAF has developed a comprehensive and systematic approach for identifying and treating invasive plant populations. In response to findings issues in 2019 and 2020, CAF developed the <i>Collins Almanor Forest Invasive Plant Species Guidance Document</i> (V1, 31 March 2021). The planning provides a framework for an invasive plant species management plan, its scope, known invasive species to occur on the FMU, survey and control methods, invasive plant management objectives, management plan development, and informational needs and additional steps required for each of these elements.</p>
<p><b>6.3.i</b> In applicable situations, the forest owner or manager identifies and applies site-specific fuels management practices, based on: (1) natural fire regimes, (2) risk of wildfire, (3) potential economic losses, (4)</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The Audit Team observed widespread use of chip thinning to reduce fuel loads and fire risk, as well as the creation of large fuel breaks. These are considerable investments, often supported by grant funding. Over 30k</p>

public safety, and (5) applicable laws and regulations.		acres have been chip thinned over the last 20 years.
<b>6.4. Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.</b>	NE	-
<b>6.5 Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and to protect water resources.</b>	NE	-
<b>6.6. Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides. World Health Organization Type 1A and 1B and chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides; pesticides that are persistent, toxic or whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use; as well as any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited. If chemicals are used, proper equipment and training shall be provided to minimize health and environmental risks.</b>	C	-
<b>6.6.a</b> No products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (see FSC-POL-30-001 EN FSC Pesticides policy 2005 and associated documents).	C	No prohibited pesticides are being used. The Audit Team reviewed pesticides use for the last year, reviewed ESRAs that the FME developed, and examined the pesticides storage area.
<b>6.6.b</b> All toxicants used to control pests and competing vegetation, including rodenticides, insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides are used only when and where non-chemical management practices are: a) not available; b) prohibitively expensive, taking into account overall environmental and social	C	Prior to using pesticides, experimental plots have been implemented to determine whether alternate control methods are available, such as mechanical control. For most use cases, pesticides were determined to be the only effective means. However, the dominant CAF silvicultural strategy means

<p>costs, risks and benefits; c) the only effective means for controlling invasive and exotic species; or d) result in less environmental damage than non-chemical alternatives (e.g., top soil disturbance, loss of soil litter and down wood debris). If chemicals are used, the forest owner or manager uses the least environmentally damaging formulation and application method practical.</p> <p>Written strategies are developed and implemented that justify the use of chemical pesticides. Whenever feasible, an eventual phase-out of chemical use is included in the strategy. The written strategy shall include an analysis of options for, and the effects of, various chemical and non-chemical pest control strategies, with the goal of reducing or eliminating chemical use.</p>		<p>that openings are small enough that competing vegetation generally does not pose a large issue.</p> <p>The FME has adopted FSC’s ESRAs for each of the pesticides that it has used on the FMU and develops application plans in accordance with those ESRAs.</p>
<p><b>6.6.c</b> Chemicals and application methods are selected to minimize risk to non-target species and sites. When considering the choice between aerial and ground application, the forest owner or manager evaluates the comparative risk to non-target species and sites, the comparative risk of worker exposure, and the overall amount and type of chemicals required.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Application is predominantly done by hand spraying. For large fire reforestation projects, however, aerial applications have been used in the past.</p> <p>Chemicals are selected to minimize impacts, as evidenced by the ESRAs.</p>
<p><b>6.6.d</b> Whenever chemicals are used, a written prescription is prepared that describes the site-specific hazards and environmental risks, and the precautions that workers will employ to avoid or minimize those hazards and risks, and includes a map of the treatment area. Chemicals are applied only by workers who have received proper training in application methods and safety. They are made aware of the risks, wear proper safety equipment, and are trained to minimize environmental impacts on non-target species and sites.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Prior to the application of pesticides, site-specific prescriptions and maps are produced. FME personnel meet onsite with the contracted state-licensed pesticide applicator at the start of each job, prior to application of pesticides. This meeting covers the maps, delineation of spray zone, special treatment requirements, and environmental risks and protection measures. Contractor PCA covers the hazards and precautions the workers must take to avoid the hazards and risks. CAF does have a qualified applicator for small applications on CAF property using CAF staff,</p>



		but this is very limited. Maps and usage information is available for these applications as well.
<b>6.6.e</b> If chemicals are used, the effects are monitored and the results are used for adaptive management. Records are kept of pest occurrences, control measures, and incidences of worker exposure to chemicals.	C	The monitoring program for pesticide applications includes pre-treatment photo points and post-treatment photo points to determine the efficacy of the treatment. Seedling survival is monitored if the treatment is associated with planting or release efforts. Unit boundaries are marked on the ground prior to the commencement of operations and these are reviewed onsite with the contractor. Contactor documents are reviewed at the job site prior to commencement of operations. CAF is also researching employment of drones to improve monitoring of seedling survival and release.
<b>6.7. Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil shall be disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations.</b>	C	-
<b>6.7.a</b> The forest owner or manager, and employees and contractors, have the equipment and training necessary to respond to hazardous spills	C	Staff and contractors have training on handling hazardous spills. Verified spill kit presence and training during visits to active harvest units.
<b>6.7.b</b> In the event of a hazardous material spill, the forest owner or manager immediately contains the material and engages qualified personnel to perform the appropriate removal and remediation, as required by applicable law and regulations.	C	No significant spills have occurred during the audit period.
<b>6.7.c.</b> Hazardous materials and fuels are stored in leak-proof containers in designated storage areas, that are outside of riparian management zones and away from other ecological sensitive features, until they are used or transported to an approved off-site location for disposal. There is no evidence of persistent fluid leaks from equipment or of	C	Hazardous materials are stored outside of riparian zones. Examined pesticide storage facility located on CAF mill premises (Site 15). No evidence of fuel leaks were seen during review of active operations.

recent groundwater or surface water contamination.		
<b>6.8. Use of biological control agents shall be documented, minimized, monitored, and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.</b>	NE	-
<b>6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</b>	C	-
<b>6.9.a</b> The use of <i>exotic species</i> is contingent on the availability of credible scientific data indicating that any such species is non-invasive and its application does not pose a risk to native biodiversity.	C	CAF as planted some giant sequoia (e.g., Sites 3 and 9). Although the trees are not native to this part of California, the species is not invasive and there is no risk of spread.
<b>6.9.b</b> If exotic species are used, their provenance and the location of their use are documented, and their ecological effects are actively monitored.	C	The location of the limited plantings of giant sequoia on the FMU is documented, and their ecological effects are monitored.
<b>6.9.c</b> The forest owner or manager shall take timely action to curtail or significantly reduce any adverse impacts resulting from their use of exotic species.	C	Although the giant sequoia are not native to this part of California, the species is not invasive and there is no risk of spread. Regardless, CAF closely monitors the limited plantings to ensure no adverse impacts.
<b>6.10. Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:</b> a) Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) Does not occur on High Conservation Value Forest areas; and c) Will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.	NE	-
<b>Principle #7: A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.</b>		
Not evaluated.		
<b>Principle #8: Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.</b>		

<p><i>Applicability Note: On small and medium-sized forests (see Glossary), an informal, qualitative assessment may be appropriate. Formal, quantitative monitoring is required on large forests and/or intensively managed forests.</i></p>		
<p><b>8.1 The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>8.1.a</b> Consistent with the scale and intensity of management, the forest owner or manager develops and consistently implements a regular, comprehensive, and replicable written monitoring protocol.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Overall, CAF’s monitoring system is well documented, comprehensive, and replicable.</p> <p>For example, CAF has an established system of permanent Continuous Forest Inventory (CFI) plots. Each of these 1-acre plots are cruised every 10 years. The CFI plots are supplemented with periodic measurements using LIDAR.</p> <p>Temporary plots on THPs are established 5 to 10 years following harvest to monitor growth response to harvest and regeneration.</p> <p>A photo point monitoring system is used for HCVs and RSAs. Regular trail camera surveys are conducted by the CAF biologist in accordance with replicable written protocols.</p>
<p><b>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>-</p>

<p><b>8.2.a.1</b> For all commercially harvested products, an inventory system is maintained. The inventory system includes at a minimum: a) species, b) volumes, c) stocking, d) regeneration, and e) stand and forest composition and structure; and f) timber quality.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>All of this information is included in the CFI permanent inventory plots.</p>
<p><b>8.2.a.2</b> Significant, unanticipated removal or loss or increased vulnerability of forest resources is monitored and recorded. Recorded information shall include date and location of occurrence, description of disturbance, extent and severity of loss, and may be both quantitative and qualitative.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The CFI system includes elements to monitor health, loss, and vulnerability. A LiDAR flight in 2018 was used to identify areas of mortality from root disease and <i>Scolytus spp.</i> All timber removals in THPs are monitored through the use of load tickets to record loads and subsequent scaling at the mill. This includes salvage of fire-damaged forests and chips from biomass projects or slash chipping efforts. This is tracked in the GIS system and is part of AAH calculations, although the SYP has a 100-year projection of AAH.</p>
<p><b>8.2.b</b> The forest owner or manager maintains records of harvested timber and NTFPs (volume and product and/or grade). Records must adequately ensure that the requirements under Criterion 5.6 are met.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Harvest volume and species is tracked in an Excel program that is managed by the forest manager and log buyer.</p>
<p><b>8.2.c</b> The forest owner or manager periodically obtains data needed to monitor presence on the FMU of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Rare, threatened and endangered species and/or their <i>habitats</i>;</li> <li>2) Common and rare plant communities and/or habitat;</li> <li>3) Location, presence and abundance of invasive species;</li> <li>4) Condition of protected areas, set-asides and buffer zones;</li> <li>5) High Conservation Value Forests (see Criterion 9.4).</li> </ol>	<p>C</p>	<p>See discussion under Criterion 6.2 and 9.4.</p>
<p><b>8.2.d.1</b> Monitoring is conducted to ensure that site specific plans and operations are properly implemented, environmental impacts of site disturbing operations are</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The THP process is utilized for this on timber harvest operations. There is an extensive plan prepared and inspections take place by the regulatory agencies to assure compliance</p>

<p>minimized, and that harvest prescriptions and guidelines are effective.</p>		<p>with the THP. CAF foresters monitor progress on THP operations, as well as other types of operations to assure that the objectives are met and that the site disturbance is minimized during operations and that all protective measures are adhered to by the contractors or workers. Interviews with operators verified that the administrating forester for each THP regularly visits active harvests.</p>
<p><b>8.2.d.2</b> A monitoring program is in place to assess the condition and environmental impacts of the forest-road system.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>A forest-road system monitoring protocol outlined in the Roads Management Plan. Road monitoring reports verified with FME personnel.</p>
<p><b>8.2.d.3</b> The landowner or manager monitors relevant socio-economic issues (see Indicator 4.4.a), including the social impacts of harvesting, participation in local economic opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.g), the creation and/or maintenance of quality job opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.b), and local purchasing opportunities (see Indicator 4.1.e).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The summary document of the sociological impacts of the Collins Almanor Forest includes data from annual monitoring.</p>
<p><b>8.2.d.4</b> Stakeholder responses to management activities are monitored and recorded as necessary.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Collins Pine Companies compiles all comments received in response to the contact information provided on the Collins Companies' website. CAF compiles locally received comments. CAL FIRE compiles all comments in written form or in oral form from public hearings related to planned activities and planning documents from CAF.</p>
<p><b>8.2.d.5</b> Where sites of cultural significance exist, the opportunity to jointly monitor sites of cultural significance is offered to tribal representatives (see Principle 3).</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>These efforts are part of the THP process and are documented in each THP, as well as in the evidenced of conformance for Principle 3. Indigenous peoples are contacted as part of the THP process and are invited to participate in location, mitigation measures, protective measures and monitoring.</p>
<p><b>8.2.e</b> The forest owner or manager monitors the costs and revenues of management in order to assess productivity and efficiency.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Per interviews with CAF personnel, management prepares quarterly reports for the Board of Directors. The company's</p>

		owners will be included in these reports beginning this year. There is also an annual timber owners meeting, which includes including project reports, operating budget, and financial metrics.
<b>8.3 Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."</b>	C	-
<b>8.3.a</b> When forest products are being sold as FSC-certified, the forest owner or manager has a system that prevents mixing of FSC-certified and non-certified forest products prior to the point of sale, with accompanying documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.	C	See <i>Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs Conformance Table (Appendix 6)</i> for evidence of conformance.
<b>8.3.b</b> The forest owner or manager maintains documentation to enable the tracing of the harvested material from each harvested product from its origin to the point of sale.	C	Harvest records are maintained for at least 5 plus years. TWC maintains all of the COC records related to sale of logs from CAF.
<b>8.4 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.</b>	C	-
<b>8.4.a</b> The forest owner or manager monitors and documents the degree to which the objectives stated in the management plan are being fulfilled, as well as significant deviations from the plan.	C	The SYP is the overarching management document for CAF. As a result of AB-1160, which was passed by the state legislature and signed into law in July 2019, the SYP is now a 20-year plan in accordance with the CFPR (previously, it was only 10 years in duration). The SYP includes updated results from forest inventory monitoring since the last SYP update. CAF employs adaptive management in its operations, which takes into consideration the degree to which the management objectives are being met.
<b>8.4.b</b> Where monitoring indicates that management objectives and guidelines, including those necessary for conformance with this Standard, are not being met or if	C	The SYP is updated every 20 years.  Examples of adaptive management includes salvage response to white fir mortality, road

<p>changing conditions indicate that a change in management strategy is necessary, the management plan, operational plans, and/or other plan implementation measures are revised to ensure the objectives and guidelines will be met. If monitoring shows that the management objectives and guidelines themselves are not sufficient to ensure conformance with this Standard, then the objectives and guidelines are modified.</p>		<p>maintenance in response to road monitoring, THP restrictions in response to raptor and amphibian surveys, and feedback provided to harvesting contractors in response to defect monitoring in the mill log yard.</p>
<p><b>8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>8.5.a</b> While protecting landowner confidentiality, either full monitoring results or an up-to-date summary of the most recent monitoring information is maintained, covering the Indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and is available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Monitoring results are summarized in a publicly-available document maintained by the staff wildlife biologist. Results include those elements of 8.2 that are not confidential.</p>
<p><b>Principle #9: Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</b></p> <p><b>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance</b></li> <li><b>b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems</b></li> <li><b>c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control)</b></li> <li><b>d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of forest areas that <i>may have</i> high conservation value attributes include, but are not limited to:</b></p> <p>Central Hardwoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old growth – (see Glossary) (a)</li> </ul>		

- Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >160 years old (a)
- Municipal watersheds –headwaters, reservoirs (c)
- Rare, Threatened, and Endangered (RTE) ecosystems, as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund’s Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern, and/or Great Lakes Assessment (b)
- Intact forest blocks in an agriculturally dominated landscape (refugia) (a)
- Intact forests >1000 ac (valuable to interior forest species) (a)
- Protected caves (a, b, or d)
- Savannas (a, b, c, or d)
- Glades (a, b, or d)
- Barrens (a, b, or d)
- Prairie remnants (a, b, or d)

North Woods/Lake States:

- Old growth – (see Glossary) (a)
- Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >120 years old (a)
- Blocks of contiguous forest, > 500 ac, which host RTEs (b)
- Oak savannas (b)
- Hemlock-dominated forests (b)
- Pine stands of natural origin (b)
- Contiguous blocks, >500 ac, of late successional species, that are managed to create old growth (a)
- Fens, particularly calcareous fens (c)
- Other non-forest communities, e.g., barrens, prairies, distinctive geological land forms, vernal pools (b or c)
- Other sites as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund’s Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern (b)

*Note: In the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region, old growth (see Glossary) is both rare and invariably an HCVF.*

*In the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region, cutting timber is not permitted in old-growth stands or forests.*

*Note: Old forests (see Glossary) may or may not be designated HCVFs. They are managed to maintain or recruit: (1) the existing abundance of old trees and (2) the landscape- and stand-level structures of old-growth forests, consistent with the composition and structures produced by natural processes.*

*Old forests that either have or are developing old-growth attributes, but which have been previously harvested, may be designated HCVFs and may be harvested under special plans that account for the ecological attributes that make it an HCVF.*

*Forest management maintains a mix of sub-climax and climax old-forest conditions in the landscape.*

<p><b>9.1 Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	<p>-</p>
--	-----------	----------



<p><b>completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.</b></p>		
<p><b>9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>9.3 The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.</b></p>	<p>NE</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</b></p>	<p>C</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>9.4.a</b> The forest owner or manager monitors, or participates in a program to annually monitor, the status of the specific HCV attributes, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. The monitoring program is designed and implemented consistent with the requirements of Principle 8.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Photo points have been established to monitor HCVs. Aspen regeneration transect monitoring also occurs. Additionally, some of the CFI plots occur in HCVs and RSAs. CAF annually produces a report that includes the results of HCV and RSA monitoring.</p>
<p><b>9.4.b</b> When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific HCV attribute, the forest owner/manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures in an effort to reverse the trend.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Most HCV areas are not managed, with the exception of aspen stands. Numerous projects have been undertaken to restore aspen and wet meadows on CAF, as seen during site visits.</p>
<p><b>Principle #10: Plantations shall be planned and managed in accordance with Principles and Criteria 1-9, and Principle 10 and its Criteria. While plantations can provide an array of social and economic benefits, and can contribute to satisfying the world's needs for forest products, they should complement the management of, reduce pressures on, and promote the restoration and conservation of natural forests.</b></p> <p>Through observation of species composition and management practices, SCS has determined that the FME’s forest management system consists entirely of natural/ semi-natural management.</p>		

**Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs Conformance Table**

Chain of Custody indicators were not evaluated during this evaluation.

REQUIREMENT	C/NC/NA
<b>1. Quality Management</b>	
1.1 The FME shall appoint a management representative as having overall responsibility and authority for the organization’s compliance with all applicable requirements of this standard.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC
<b>Evidence 1.1:</b> Management representatives have been appointed at both the site (i.e., CAF) and multi-site (i.e., corporate) levels.	
1.2 A system shall be implemented to track and trace all products that are sold with an FSC Claim from the <i>forest of origin</i> to the <i>forest gate(s)</i> . When legally required, and for group and multiple FMU certificates, this system shall also be documented. <i>The forest of origin should be the smallest reportable manageable unit, such as a tax parcel. It shall never be larger than a Forest Management Unit (FMU).</i> <i>The forest gate is defined as the point where the change in ownership of the certified-forest product occurs.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> NA, FME does not sell any products with an FSC claim
<b>Evidence 1.2:</b> Sales are done via an internal transfer between CAF and TWC. Going forward, TWC FSC trip tickets are used for each load.	
1.3 The FME shall maintain complete records of all FSC-related COC activities, including sales and training, for at least 5 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC
<b>Evidence 1.3:</b> FME maintains COC-related records for a minimum of 7 years.	
1.4 The FME shall define its <i>forest gate(s)</i> (check all that apply):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Stump</b> <i>Stumpage sale or sales of standing timber; transfer of ownership of certified-forest product occurs upon harvest.</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>On-site concentration yard</b> <i>Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at concentration yard under control of FME.</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Off-site Mill/ Log Yard/ Port</b> <i>Transfer of ownership occurs when certified-product is unloaded or paid for at purchaser’s facility or a facility under the purchaser’s control.</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Auction house/ Brokerage</b> <i>Transfer of ownership occurs at a government-run or private auction house/ brokerage.</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Lump-sum sale/ Per Unit/ Pre-Paid Agreement</b> <i>A timber sale in which the buyer and seller agree on a total price for marked standing trees or for trees within a defined area before the wood is removed — the timber is usually paid for <u>before</u> harvesting begins. Similar to a per-unit sale.</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Log landing</b> <i>Transfer of ownership of certified-product occurs at landing/yarding areas.</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b> (Please describe):	
1.5 The FME shall have sufficient control over its <i>forest gate(s)</i> to ensure that there is no risk of mixing of FSC-certified forest products covered by the scope of the FM/COC certificate with forest products from outside of the scope prior to the transfer of ownership.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> NA, FME does not sell any products with an FSC claim
<b>Evidence 1.4/1.5:</b> There is no risk of mixing FSC-certified product with non-FSC since all ownership of logs transfers prior to harvest.	

<p>1.6 The FME and its contractors shall not process FSC-certified material prior to transfer of ownership at the <i>forest gate(s)</i> without conforming to applicable chain of custody requirements.</p> <p><i>NOTE: This does not apply to log cutting or de-barking units, small portable sawmills, on-site processing of chips/biomass or primary processing of Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) under the FME's control (e.g., latex, rattan, maple syrup, etc.) originating from the FMU under evaluation.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> NA
<p><b>Evidence 1.6:</b> No processing occurs before products are sold as FSC-certified.</p>	
<p>1.7 The FME has supported transaction verification conducted by SCS and Assurance Services International (ASI) by providing samples of FSC transaction data as requested by SCS.</p> <p><i>NOTE: Pricing information is not within the scope of transaction verification data disclosure.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA, no verification requested
<p>1.8 The FME shall support fiber testing by surrendering samples and specimens of materials and information about species composition and the location where the sample originated for verification, as requested by its certification body, ASI or FSC.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA, no verification requested
<p><b>Evidence 1.7/1.8:</b> CAF has not been asked to support these efforts.</p>	
<p><b>2. Product Control, Sales and Delivery</b></p>	
<p>2.1. Products from the certified forest area shall be identifiable as certified at the <i>forest gate(s)</i>.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> NA, FME does not sell any products with an FSC claim
<p><b>Evidence 2.1:</b> TWC has procedures in place to ensure the identification of certified material.</p>	
<p>2.2 Information about all products sold shall be compiled and documented for all FMUs in the scope of certification, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Common and scientific species name;</li> <li>2) Product name or description;</li> <li>3) Volume (or quantity) of product;</li> <li>4) Information to trace the material to the source of origin harvest block;</li> <li>5) Harvest date;</li> <li>6) If basic processing activities take place in the forest, the date and volume/quantity produced; and</li> <li>7) Whether or not the material was sold with an FSC Claim.</li> </ol>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC
<p><b>Evidence 2.2:</b> FME carefully tracks harvest volumes, including the specific requirements of this indicator. At the mill, which is outside the scope of this certificate, volumes are tracked on an incoming wood register coded by sale, volume delivered, species, etc. Log accounting software is used for tracking and reporting.</p>	

<p>2.3. The FME shall ensure that all sales documents issued for outputs sold with FSC claims include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) name and contact details of the FME;</li> <li>b) information to identify the customer, such as their name and address;</li> <li>c) date when the document was issued;</li> <li>d) product name or description, including common and scientific species name(s);</li> <li>e) quantity of products sold;</li> <li>f) the FME’s FSC Forest Management (FM/COC) or FSC Controlled Wood (CW/FM) code;</li> <li>g) clear indication of the FSC claim for each product item or the total products as follows:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the claim “FSC 100%” for products from FSC 100% product groups; or</li> <li>ii. the claim “FSC Controlled Wood” for products from FSC Controlled Wood product groups.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C  <input type="checkbox"/> NC  <input type="checkbox"/> NA, FME does not sell any products with an FSC claim</p>
<p>2.4 If the sales documentation issued by the FME is not included with the shipment of the product and this information is relevant for the customer to identify the product as being FSC certified, the related delivery documentation has included the same information as required in indicator 2.3 and a reference linking it to the sales documentation.</p> <p><b>Note: 2.3 and 2.4 are based on FSC-STD-40-004 V3-0 Clauses 5.1 and 5.3</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> C  <input type="checkbox"/> NC  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA, delivery documentation not required or FME is not responsible for issuing delivery documentation  <input type="checkbox"/> NA, FME does not sell any products with an FSC claim</p>
<p><b>Evidence 2.3/2.4:</b>                  2.3: Sales are done via an internal transfer between CAF and TWC. See TWC certificate SCS-COC-000023 for examples of external sales.                  2.4: Since sales are done with an internal transfer and sold on the stump, there are no delivery documents aside from trip tickets.</p>	
<p>2.5 If the FME is unable to include the FSC claim and/or certificate code in sales or delivery documents, the required information has been provided to the customer through supplementary documentation (e.g. supplementary letters). In this case, the FME has obtained permission from SCS to implement supplementary documentation in accordance with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. there shall exist clear information linking the supplementary documentation to the sales or delivery documents;</li> <li>b. there is no risk that the customer will misinterpret which products are or are not FSC certified in the supplementary documentation; and</li> <li>c. where the sales documents contain multiple products with different FSC claims, each product shall be cross-referenced to the associated FSC claim provided in the supplementary documentation.</li> </ul>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C  <input type="checkbox"/> NC  <input type="checkbox"/> NA, all information included per 2.3 and/or 2.4</p>
<p><b>Evidence 2.5:</b> See 2.3/2.4 above.</p>	

<p>2.6 The FME may identify products exclusively made of input materials from small or community producers by adding the following claim to sales documents: “From small or community forest producers.” This claim can be passed on along the supply chain by certificate holders.</p> <p><i>A forest management unit (FMU) or group of FMUs that meet(s) the small and low-intensity managed forest eligibility criteria (FSC-STD-1-003a) and addenda. A community FMU must comply with the tenure and management criteria defined in FSC-STD-40-004.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> C  <input type="checkbox"/> NC  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA, not a small or community producer; or does not wish to pass along this claim</p>
<p><b>Evidence 2.6:</b> NA</p>	
<p><b>3. Labeling and Promotion</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> NA – FME does not use/ intend to use trademarks and no trademark uses were detected during the audit.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> NA – <b>CW/FM certificates are not allowed to use FSC trademarks and no trademark uses were detected during the audit</b> (<i>Note: it is a Major nonconformity to 3.1 if CW/FM certificates are found to be using trademarks</i>).</p>	
<p>3.1 The FME shall adhere to relevant trademark use requirements of FSC-STD-50-001 described in the <i>SCS Trademark Annex for FMEs</i>.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C  <input type="checkbox"/> NC</p>
<p><b>Evidence 3.1:</b> Refer to evidence and findings cited in applicable trademark checklist(s) cited below.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>FSC trademark use was detected for a CW/FM certificate as described in Major CAR for 3.1, FSC-STD-30-010, Annex 3, 1.2, and FSC-STD-50-001, 2.1e and 11.2:</i></p>	
<p><b>4. Outsourcing</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> NA – FME does not outsource any COC-related activities, as confirmed via interviews, sales documentation, and field observation.</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA – FME outsources low-risk activities such as transport and harvesting, as confirmed via interviews, sales documentation, and field observation.</p>	
<p>4.1 The FME shall provide the names and contact details of all outsourced service providers.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> C  <input type="checkbox"/> NC</p>
<p>4.2 The FME shall have a control system for the outsourced process and agreement which ensures that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The material used for the production of FSC-certified material is traceable and not mixed with any other material prior to the point of transfer of legal ownership;</li> <li>The outsourcer keeps records of FSC-certified material covered under the outsourcing agreement;</li> <li>The FME issues the final invoice for the processed or produced FSC-certified material following outsourcing;</li> <li>The outsourcer only uses FSC trademarks on products covered by the scope of the outsourcing agreement and not for promotional use;</li> <li>The outsourcer does not further outsource the material; and</li> <li>The outsourcer accepts the right of the certificate body to audit them.</li> </ol>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> C  <input type="checkbox"/> NC</p>
<p><b>Evidence 4.1/4.2:</b></p>	
<p><b>5. Training and/or Communication Strategies/</b></p>	
<p>5.1 All relevant FME staff and outsourcers shall be trained in the FME’s COC control system commensurate with the scale and intensity of operations and shall demonstrate competence in implementing the FME’s COC control system.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C  <input type="checkbox"/> NC</p>

<p>5.2 The FME shall maintain up-to-date records of its COC training and/or communications program, such as a list of trained employees, completed COC trainings or communications, the intended frequency of COC training (e.g., training plan), and related program materials (e.g., presentations, memos, contracts, employee handbooks, etc.).</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC</p>
<p><b>Evidence 5.1/5.2:</b> Review of personnel training records and interviews with both staff and contractors verify that all involved in the tracing of certified product are well trained and knowledgeable about procedures.</p>	

## Appendix 7 – Trademark Standard Conformance Table

- N/A, does not use/intend to use FSC trademarks for any purposes (finished with this section); or
- N/A, is fully integrated and all trademark uses are treated under the COC Annex to this report that includes a full review of FSC-STD-40-004 and FSC-STD-50-001.

<b>1. General Requirements for Use of the FSC Trademarks</b> (FSC “checkmark-and-tree” logo, initials “FSC,” and/or name “Forest Stewardship Council”)		
<p><b>Trademark uses reviewed:</b></p>		
<b>Trademark Application (on-product/promotional)</b>	<b>Case Approval #, or Email (include approver name &amp; date), or other appropriate documentation</b>	<b>Are all elements correct? (e.g., trademark symbol, color scheme, size, etc.) If not, describe in Nonconformities below.</b>
<p>Email signature</p>	<p>Approval with Collins corporate in SCS approver database.</p>	<p>Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Website</p>	<p>Approval with Collins corporate in SCS approver database.</p>	<p>Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All known uses reviewed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sample reviewed. Rationale that sample choice is sufficient to confirm requirements are met:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Trademark uses detected include those grandfathered in under prior FSC trademark rules (e.g., FSC-TMK-50-201). Place the initials “GF” by the specific Trademark Applications above. <i>Note: This only applies to printed items or physical promotional materials (e.g., hats, load tickets) in stock. New printings, items, and websites must be updated per FSC-STD-50-001 requirements. If the organization only has GF uses and no new uses, the rest of this checklist is NA.</i></p>		
<p><b>1.2 Trademark License Agreement and valid certificate</b>                      In order to use these FSC trademarks, the FME shall have a valid FSC trademark license agreement and hold a valid certificate.  <i>Note: Consultations for certification Organizations applying for forest management certification or conducting activities related to the implementation of controlled wood requirements, may refer to FSC by name and initials for stakeholder consultation.</i></p>		<p>Maintained on file by SCS Main Office</p>
<p><b>Evidence 1.2:</b> Maintained on file by SCS Main Office.</p>		
<p><b>1.6 Product Group List</b></p>		<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C</p>

<p>The products intended to be labeled or promoted as FSC certified have been included in the organization’s certified product group list.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> NC  <input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/  <input type="checkbox"/> OBS</p>
<p><b>Evidence 1.6:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refer to Product Groups List in Public Summary Report;  <input type="checkbox"/> The following nonconformance(s) were detected in Product Groups:            ;  or  <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to OBS related to Product Groups:</p>	
<p><b>1.3 Trademark License Code</b>  The FSC trademark license code assigned by FSC to the organization accompanies any use of the FSC trademarks. It is sufficient to show the code once per product or promotional material.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C  <input type="checkbox"/> NC  <input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/  <input type="checkbox"/> OBS</p>
<p><b>1.4 Trademark Symbol</b>  The FSC logo and the ‘Forests For All Forever’ marks shall include the trademark symbol ® in the upper right corner when used on products or materials to be distributed in a country where the relevant trademark is registered.  For use in a country where the trademark is not yet registered, use of the symbol ™ is recommended. The Trademark Registration List document is available in the FSC trade-mark portal and marketing toolkit.  The symbol ® shall also be added to ‘FSC’ and ‘Forest Steward-ship Council’ at the first or most prominent use in any text; one use per material is sufficient (e.g. website or brochure).  <i>NOTE: The use of the trademark symbol is not required for FSC claims in sales and delivery documents, or for the disclaimer statement specified in requirement 6.2.</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C  <input type="checkbox"/> NC  <input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/  <input type="checkbox"/> OBS  <input type="checkbox"/> NA, one or more of noted exceptions applies</p>
<p><b>2.1 Restrictions on using FSC trademarks</b>  The organization <b>has not used</b> the FSC trademarks in the following ways:  a) in a way that could cause confusion, misinterpretation, or loss of credibility to the FSC certification scheme;  b) in a way that implies that FSC endorses, participates in, or is responsible for activities performed by the organization, outside the scope of certification;  c) to promote product quality aspects not covered by FSC certification;  d) in product brand or company names, such as ‘FSC Golden Timber’ or website domain names;  e) in connection with FSC controlled wood or controlled material – they shall not be used for labelling products or in any promotion of sales or sourcing of controlled material or FSC controlled wood; the initials FSC shall only be used to pass on FSC controlled wood claims in sales and de-livery documentation, in conformity with FSC chain of custody requirements.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C  <input type="checkbox"/> NC  <input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/  <input type="checkbox"/> OBS</p>
<p><b>2.2 Translations</b>  The name ‘Forest Stewardship Council’ has not been replaced with a translation. A translation may be included in brackets after the name, for example: Forest Stewardship Council® (translation)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C  <input type="checkbox"/> NC  <input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/  <input type="checkbox"/> OBS  <input type="checkbox"/> NA, no translations</p>
<p><b>Evidence 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, and 2.2:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refer to Trademark uses reviewed above;  <input type="checkbox"/> The following nonconformance(s) were detected            ; or</p>	

<input type="checkbox"/> Refer to OBS:	
<p><b>Sections 8 and 9 Graphic Rules</b>                  The organization has only used FSC logos that conform to the standard requirements governing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• color and font (8.1-8.3);</li> <li>• format and size (8.4-8.9);</li> <li>• label placement (8.10); and</li> <li>• ‘Forests For All Forever’ marks (9.1-9.7).</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/ OBS
<p><b>1.5 Trademark Use Approval</b>                  The organization has submitted all intended uses of the FSC trademarks to SCS for approval.                  OR                  The organization has <b>an approved trademark use management system</b> in place. (If the organization has a trademark use management system, complete Annex A.)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/ OBS
<p><b>4.6 FSC trademarks may be used to identify FSC-certified materials in the chain of custody before the products are finished. It is not necessary to submit such segregation marks for approval. All segregation marks shall be removed before the products go to the final point of sale or are delivered to uncertified organizations.</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/ OBS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA, trademarks no used for segregation marks
<p><b>Evidence Graphic Rules, 1.5, and 4.6:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refer to Trademark uses reviewed above;  <input type="checkbox"/> The following nonconformance(s) were detected ; or  <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to OBS:</p>	

**2. On-Product Use of FSC Trademarks**  
 NA, no use of on-product trademarks (*on-product checklist may be deleted*)

**3. Promotional Use of FSC Trademarks**  
 NA, no use of promotional trademarks (*promotional checklist may be deleted*)

<p><b>6.1 Catalogues, Brochures, and Websites</b>                  When the FSC trademarks have been used in catalogues, brochures, or websites, the following requirements apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is sufficient to present the promotional elements only once in catalogues, brochures, websites, etc.</li> <li>• If both FSC-certified and uncertified products are listed then a text such as “Look for our FSC®-certified products” shall be used next to the promotional elements and the FSC-certified products shall be clearly identified.</li> <li>• If some or all of the products are available as FSC certified on request only, this is be clearly stated.</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC <input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/ OBS <input type="checkbox"/> NA, not using trademarks in catalogues/ brochures/websites
<p><b>6.2 Sales and Delivery Documents</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> NC



<p>When the FSC trademarks are included on sales or delivery document templates that may be used for both FSC and non-FSC products, the following or a similar statement is included: “Only the products that are identified as such on this document are FSC certified”.</p> <p><i>NOTE: Use of the FSC claim and certificate code on the invoices does not qualify as FSC trademark use.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/ OBS</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA, not using trademarks on templates for FSC &amp; non-FSC products</p>
<p><b>6.3 Promotional Items</b></p> <p>All promotional items (e.g., mugs, pens, T-shirts, caps, banners, vehicles, etc.) have displayed, at minimum, the FSC logo and FSC trademark license code.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> C</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/ OBS</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA, not labeling promotional items</p>
<p><b>6.5 Trade Fairs</b></p> <p>When the FSC trademarks are used for promotion at trade fairs, the organization has:</p> <p>a) clearly marked which products are FSC certified, or</p> <p>b) add a visible disclaimer stating “Ask for our FSC®-certified products” or similar if no FSC-certified products are displayed.</p> <p><i>NOTE: Use of text to describe the FSC certification of the organization does not require a disclaimer.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> C</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/ OBS</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA, not using trademarks at trade fairs</p>
<p><b>Section 6.6 and 6.7 Investment/Financial Claims</b></p> <p>6.6 When investment companies or others are making financial claims based on the organization’s FSC certified operations, the organization has taken full responsibility for the use of the FSC trademarks.</p> <p>6.7 Any such claims have been accompanied by the disclaimer, “FSC is not responsible for and does not endorse any financial claims on returns on investments.”</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> C</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/ OBS</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA, not making financial claims about FSC status</p>
<p><b>7.1 and 7.2 Other Forestry Certification Scheme Logos</b></p> <p>The FSC trademarks have not been used together with the marks of other forest certification schemes in a way which implies equivalence, or in a way which is disadvantageous to the FSC trademarks in terms of size or placement.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> C</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/ OBS</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA, not using other scheme logos</p>
<p><b>7.3 Business Cards</b></p> <p>The FSC trademarks have not used on business cards to promote the organization’s certification.</p> <p>The FSC logo or ‘Forests For All Forever’ marks are not used on business cards for promotion.</p> <p>A text reference to the organization’s FSC certification, with license code, is allowed, for example “We are FSC® certified (FSC® C#####)” or “We sell FSC®-certified products (FSC® C#####)”.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/ OBS</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NA, approval granted prior to July 1, 2011</p>
<p><b>7.4 Promotion with CB Logo</b></p> <p>FSC certified products have not been promoted using only the SCS Kingfisher and/or SCS Global Services logo.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C w/ OBS/ c/ OBS</p>
<p><b>Evidence 6.1-6.3, 6.5-6.7, 7.1-7.4:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refer to Trademark uses reviewed above;</p>	

<input type="checkbox"/> The following nonconformance(s) were detected ; or	
<input type="checkbox"/> Refer to OBS:	

**Annex A: Trademark use management system**  
 NA, not using a trademark management system (*Annex A checklist may be deleted*)

**Annex B, Additional trademark rules for group FM certificate holders**  
 NA, not a group FM certificate or group does not use FSC trademarks (*Annex B checklist may be deleted*)

## Appendix 8 – Group Management Program

This is not a group certificate, so this appendix is not applicable.